

REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated October 4, 2004 has been received and carefully noted. The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Claims 20 and 27 are pending, claims 13-19 and 21-26 having been withdrawn under 37 CFR § 1.142(b). Applicants reserve the right to file a continuation application on the non-elected subject matter.

By this Amendment, claims 20 and 27 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 20 and 27 are presented for further examination.

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Rejection Of Claims 20 and 27 Under 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

In the outstanding Final Office Action, claims 20 and 27 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Independent claim 20 has been amended responsive to this rejection. If any additional amendment is necessary to overcome this rejection, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Claims 20 and 27 Recite Patentable Subject Matter

Claims 20 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art as set forth in pages 1-2 of the specification (hereinafter "AAPA") and further in view of either Ruehl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,216,763, hereinafter "Ruehl") or Leith (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,628, hereinafter "Leith"). It is noted that independent claim 20 has been amended. To the extent that the

rejection remains applicable to pending claims 20 and 27, Applicant hereby traverses the rejection, as follows.

Independent claim 20 recites a method for joining frame members including, among others, a feature of providing a mold having engagement parts and a guide groove that extends from at least one of the engagement parts toward the inside of the mold, wherein the engagement parts hold respective frame members in the condition that the connection parts of the respective frame members are positioned within the molten metal cavity of the mold, and such that the guide groove extends from the at least one engagement part along at least one of the connection parts to the vicinity of a middle of the at least one of the connection parts, and a gap is provided between the guide groove and the at least one of the connection parts.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the AAPA, Reuhl, and Leith, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the guide groove and the gap provided between the guide groove and at least one of the connection parts, as recited in pending claim 20.

The outstanding Office Action asserts that Leith discloses a gap in mold section 32 between “the protrusion portion” and the crankpin 20. Applicant respectfully submits that it is not understood what is meant by “the protrusion portion,” as no such language can be found in the Leith reference.

However, in an attempt to advance prosecution of this application, it will be assumed, *arguendo*, that the gap referred to in the outstanding Office Action is the space between the upper end of the mold cavity 36 (inner side surface of cut out portion of mold half 32) and cylindrical side of the end portion 20 of the crankpin 14, as

illustrated in Fig. 2 of Leith. It will further be assumed that the inner surface of the recessed portion of mold half 32, which, with mold half 34, forms the mold cavity 36 when mold halves 32 and 34 are in the closed position, is asserted to be analogous to the "guide groove" of claim 20.

According to the interpretation of Leith set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the inner surface of the recessed portion of the mold half 32 (e.g., "guide groove" according to the assumptions above) of Leith does not extend from "the at least one engagement part to the vicinity of a middle of the at least one connection part," as recited in claim 20. Rather, assuming the above interpretation of Leith, the inner surface of the recessed portion of mold half 32 (e.g., "guide groove") of Leith extends from the inner surface of the recessed portion of the mold half 32 to the end 20 of the crankpin 14.

Thus, Leith fails to disclose or suggest providing a mold in which a guide groove is provided from at least one engagement part to the vicinity of a middle of at least one connection part wherein a gap is provided between the guide groove and the at least one connection part, as recited in pending claim 20.

Similarly, neither Reuhl nor the AAPA discloses or suggests such a feature. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests each and every feature of independent claim 20. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 is patentably distinct over the cited combination and in condition for allowance.

Claim 27 depends from claim 20. Therefore, claim 27 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 20, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing response, favorable reconsideration of this application and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 106145-00021.**

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX, PLLC


Michele L. Connell
Registration No. 52,763

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: (202) 857-6104
Facsimile: (202) 857-6395

CMM/MLC:sg